

Yuba-Bear River Watershed

| Comment  | Commenter    | Edit to Vol II Made | Response  |
|--|--------------|---------------------|---|
| <b>YUBA-BEAR RIVER WATERSHED</b>   |              |                     |   |
| <b>Lake Spaulding Planning Unit</b>  |              |                     |   |
| <p><i>Identify in "Existing Conditions" the location and significance of existing diversions and ditch/flume facilities of Placer County Water Agency and Nevada Irrigation District in text and maps.</i></p> | <p>EBMUD</p> | <p>No</p>           | <p>These details are not being shown or described for any water agency or water district throughout the Watershed Lands and were therefore not added to the Existing Conditions text or maps. Please see Volume I section 2.4.1 which provides a description of the restrictions on LCP recommendations regarding hydroelectric and associated water delivery facilities.</p> |

| <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Commenter</b>   | <b>Edit to Vol II Made</b> | <b>Response</b>  |
|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| <p>These comments are submitted on behalf of Don Ryber, Chair, Tsi-Akim Maidu Tribe of Nevada City.</p> <p>The Tsi-Akim Tribe is particularly interested in taking ownership of the lands in the Bear River Valley that are mentioned in Volume II. The flat area that Highway 20 cuts through, including the meadow around the River itself, has been the traditional lands of our people for thousands of years. This includes a major village site, sacred site, and many more petroglyphs and other artifacts than your surveys have yet revealed.</p> <p>Our review of the maps shows that the lands we are interested in will be given in fee title by PG&amp;E. We wish to work closely with the Council to ensure that the lands we are interested in are properly protected, and feel that the best way to do this is to give the lands directly to the Tsi-Akim Maidu. We are a 501(c) (3) tax-exempt organization with broad public support in Nevada County.</p> <p>The question of how to best identify, in order to protect, our sacred places and village sites is difficult. It is our practice to not reveal the location of these sacred sites. The best way to ensure that these sites are protected is to return them to their rightful stewards.</p> <p>The river valley that we are interested in is surrounded by many other parcels that will be given away. We think it is important that all the parties that do take ownership of these lands in this region work closely with each other to create and maintain sustainable and respectful uses of the land. The Tribe wishes to be a coordinator of this effort.</p> <p>The river valley and rocky walls that make up the parcels we are interested bring many opportunities for our tribe to restore cultural sites and to bring our history and practices to light after more than 100 years since our Tribe lost access to its land base. The LCP indicates that cultural restoration is a top priority of the Council as it is of ours.</p> | <p>Izzy Martin on behalf of Don Ryber, Chair, Tsi-Akim Maidu Tribe</p> | <p>No</p>                  | <p>Comment noted. Text has been added to the Supporting Analysis for Recommendations and main Volume II documents stating that special efforts will be undertaken to consult with spiritual religious leaders of the tribes when developing a plan that affects religious or sacred places.</p> <p>The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified conservation easement and fee simple donees will be determined during the development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). The identification and protection of cultural resources (e.g., culturally significant areas and sites) is included as a potential measure in many planning units and will be the focus of discussions during disposition. There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p> |

Yuba-Bear River Watershed

| Comment  | Commenter                            | Edit to Vol II Made | Response  |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| <p>Because the Forest Service manages adjacent and surrounding lands, the Forest Service is the obvious donee for these lands. The Sierra Club has worked for decades to consolidate public ownership in the Grouse Lakes area and supports inclusion of these watershed lands in Tahoe National Forest.</p>   | <p>John K Moore,<br/>Sierra Club</p> | <p>No</p>           | <p>Comment noted. The Stewardship Council is developing an explicit set of criteria that will be used to determine which potential donees are qualified to participate in the disposition process. Qualified conservation easement and fee simple donees will be determined during the development of the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). There will be opportunities for the public and stakeholders to engage with the Stewardship Council and other stakeholders on this topic as well as other topics related to the disposition and future management and stewardship of the lands. The Stewardship Council will provide public notice and encourage participation in meetings, workshops, and other appropriate methods of participation in the planning process.</p> |
| <p>Lindsey Lakes (Lower, Middle, and Upper), Culbertson Lake, and Rock Lakes (Lower and Upper), and vicinity (Lake Spaulding Planning Unit)</p> <p>These six attractive reservoirs are a favorite destination for camping, fishing, water sports, hiking, and backpacking. Future management should emphasize maintaining and enhancing the lands' outstanding open space values, scenic quality, and recreational values. These public benefits are far greater than the commodity values of the lands.</p> | <p>John K Moore,<br/>Sierra Club</p> | <p>No</p>           | <p>As per the Settlement Agreement and Stipulation, PG&amp;E must protect the Watershed Lands with perpetual conservation easements, or some equivalent legal mechanism, to preserve and enhance six Beneficial Public Values (BPVs) including natural habitat, open space, outdoor recreation, sustainable forestry, agriculture, and historic values. The conservation easements must preserve and enhance the BPVs. Implementation of the LCP must preserve and enhance the BPVs on an overall basis.</p>  |

| Comment  | Commenter                            | Edit to Vol II Made | Response   |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <p>Maintenance of aesthetic values and recreational values should constrain harvesting of timber from these watershed lands. Timber harvesting in areas of high recreational use should be limited to salvaging dead or dying hazard trees. The forests should be managed to complement Forest Service management of adjacent lands, where maintaining old-growth forest characteristics to benefit rare forest carnivores is a primary goal of management. The LCP notes that PG&amp;E is planning a 240-acre timber harvest on these watershed lands in the near future. The Sierra Club is very concerned about the sale's potential damage to scenic quality and recreational values, and has urged PG&amp;E to postpone the sale. Other arguments for postponing the sale are that the lands are preliminarily designated for disposition and the emphasis of future management may be much different. Years ago PG&amp;E and the Forest Service installed a gate at Lower Lindsey Lake to close this area to motorized public recreation (PG&amp;E and landowners have access). This exclusion of vehicles, which has enhanced recreational experiences, should be maintained. Mysteriously, this vehicle exclusion is not shown on the Existing Conditions map.</p> | <p>John K Moore,<br/>Sierra Club</p> | <p>No</p>           | <p>Comment noted. Until final determinations are made and actions are taken regarding lands to be retained in fee title by PG&amp;E and lands to be donated, PG&amp;E remains the landowner and manager. Details on timber management and harvesting prescriptions would be developed as part of the potential measure to develop a forest management plan for each relevant planning unit. Conservation easements, and overall objectives for management plans, will be developed as part of the disposition process and will be included in the Disposition Packages (Volume IIIs). Specifics of management plans will likely be developed post transaction. Coordination with U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is noted as a priority in Volume II: "we expect that all of these plans [forest, fuels, fire management and response] would be developed in coordination with management and practices of the USFS and Placer and Nevada Counties, as appropriate." The USFS Grouse Lakes Vehicle Control Area is indeed noted on the map; however, it may be lost due to the busy nature of the both the Existing Conditions and Recommended Concept maps. On the Existing Conditions map, the area is outlined in khaki and the label can be found south of the Carr-Feeley Lakes. On the Recommended Concept map, the area is also outlined in khaki and the label can be found on the eastern portion of the map near the directional arrow for Truckee.</p> |

## Yuba-Bear River Watershed

| Comment   | Commenter                            | Edit to Vol II Made | Response  |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| <p>Several small ponds are located on parcel 135-29-35-3 in the NE1/4 of section 30, T 17 N, R 12 E. They are shown, albeit faintly, on map YB-2. The following description of the ponds and their ecological and educational values was supplied by John Olmstead of Nevada City, who is very well informed about the ponds.</p> <p>Next to PG&amp;E's excellently planned and developed Sierra Discovery Forest Education Trail are about 60 acres of undeveloped PG&amp;E lands west of Bowman Lake Road and north of historically significant South Yuba Canal remnants. Old-growth Ponderosa Forest specimen trees surround four differing scenic and biologically important ponds. The large trees have twice been deleted from PG&amp;E timber sales at the request of school children and John Olmsted of California Institute of Man in Nature (PG&amp;E Old Yuba Powerhouse owner). The ponds are glacially carved in roof pendant sea-bed metamorphic rocks. They overlook the South Yuba Canyon where the former Bear River headwaters north of Hwy. 20 were pirated into the Yuba during recent uplifts and glaciations of the Sierra Nevada. Wildlife observed by field trips include western pond turtles, night hawks (daytime) and mountain lions. Bear Valley has the second highest diversity of butterfly species in California. These ponds should be shown as a Feature of Importance on the EC map, and the RC should include measures to safeguard and enhance their ecological and educational values.</p> <p>Mr. Olmstead can be contacted [contact information omitted].</p> <p>This information about the glacial ponds was supplied to the Council early in the preparation of the Land Conservation Plan, but the information has been ignored.</p> | <p>John K Moore,<br/>Sierra Club</p> | <p>Yes</p>          | <p>Comment noted. Information regarding the glacial ponds has been added to the Bear River Existing Conditions text in Volume II. The area of the glacial ponds has also been added to the Existing Conditions map.</p> |

| Comment   | Commenter                            | Edit to Vol II Made | Response  |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| <p>The LCP recommends a "walk-in" group campground at Lower Rock Lake. Lower Rock Lake is not a very large lake, and the campground could potentially exclude other recreational use at the lake. Also, "walk-in campground" is not precisely defined. Would the campground be a "backpack-in" campground to which the campers carry all their supplies from Lower Lindsey Lake, or a campground to which campers walk and vehicles transport supplies? Only a "backpack-in" campground would be consistent with the vehicle exclusion. Sanitary facilities would have to be provided; what other facilities are planned?</p> | <p>John K Moore,<br/>Sierra Club</p> | <p>No</p>           | <p>This potential measure has been removed from the Recommended Concept for this planning unit.</p> |